

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 860

SP 008 229

AUTHOR Pasch, Marvin; Pozdol, Marvin
TITLE The Development of Field Based Teacher Education Programs at Cleveland State University.
PUB DATE Sep 73
NOTE 5p.; A Position Paper submitted to the College of Education, Cleveland State University
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; *Field Experience Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Student Teaching; *Teacher Centers

ABSTRACT

This paper defines field-based teacher education and offers some generalizations concerning field-based teacher education programs. Field-based teacher education is defined as an on-site teacher education center in a school or group of schools that may be used for observing, practicing methodology, and learning and practicing methods on-site the entire year. The following generalizations are made concerning field-based teacher education programs. One, teacher education centers should be governed under a principle of "shared sovereignty." Two, joint planning and goal setting by the college of education and participating schools must precede all field-based activities. Three, there must be an on-going means of reporting and evaluating. Four, undergraduates in the college of education should have an extensive field-based experience. Five, students should experience a variety of ethnic and socioeconomic environments. Six, there is a need to review present faculty expectations regarding teaching load and responsibilities. Seven, in-service education must be an inherent component of any field-based program. Eight, the college of education must organize more effectively to meet in-service needs in areas such as instruction, curriculum, and program evaluation and research. The author concludes by asking if the effort of such programs are worthwhile and practical. An 8-item bibliography is included. (PD).

THE DEVELOPMENT OF FIELD BASED
TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS
AT CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A POSITION PAPER SUBMITTED TO THE
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, SEPTEMBER 1973

Dr. Marvin Pasch
Dr. Marvin Pozdol

Most teacher education programs have included a field based component with student teaching usually being a culminating field experience. At CSU, and earlier in Fenn College, most students majoring in elementary education or completing secondary certification have had experiences in the field as part of methods courses as well as during student teaching. In recent years, field experiences required in the College of Education have increased. Even though in limited numbers, projects such as those in Mentor and Parma have provided a full year or more of field experiences for pre-service teachers majoring in elementary education. During the 1973-74 school year, about thirty students who are members of the Cleveland Board of Education's Careers Opportunity Program (C.O.P.) will be entering the College of Education. Most of these students have been part time students at Cuyahoga Community College and half day teacher aides in the Cleveland schools. The C.O.P. students will continue their field based experiences as they complete degree requirements at Cleveland State. In addition, student teacher centers have been established in secondary schools in Cleveland and suburban districts. The Center West Proposal,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

involving the Cleveland Public Schools and CSU is also about to be initiated in a mature form. Field based teacher education activity at CSU has been on-going as well as growing.

Field based teacher education is based on-site in a school or group of schools which may be called teacher education centers. They may be centers for CSU student observations, opportunities for students in methods courses to practice methodology, centers such as in Parma and Mentor where students are learning and practicing methods on-site the entire year and centers which include a concentration of student teachers. A field based program may include all or some combination of the above.

Although we are not in a position to formally evaluate, we can offer the following generalizations concerning field based teacher education programs.

1. Many writers in the area of field based programs suggest teacher education centers should be governed under a principle of "shared sovereignty". The participating institutions must shift from the protection of rights, privilege and retained power to open, honest, aggressive yet collaborative searching for answers.
2. A great deal of joint planning and goal setting by the College of Education and participating schools must precede all field based activities. All those who are involved must have a legitimate role, not just in supervision but also in governance and planning. Looking dispassionately at our previous field efforts, it would appear that university personnel have been more active and directive than they ought to be. Ways must be found to create a true collegial atmosphere among those working in a field based program where each works to further the goals of the center.

3. An on-going means of reporting and evaluation must be a part of any field based program. The Field Based Development Team has made recommendations in this area and should take the lead in encouraging implementation, evaluation and dissemination of information concerning the various field based activities in the College of Education.
4. Undergraduates in the College of Education should have a larger field based experience than is now available. Consideration should be given to introductory field based programs for freshmen and sophomores who are considering teaching as a profession. In addition, basic psychology courses should have a field based component. The College of Education might also consider a professional quarter(s) or year as being optional or mandatory.
5. In order to implement the above, care needs to be taken so that teacher education centers are balanced between traditional and innovative schools, between Cleveland and suburban schools, and between east side and west side locations. Field based activity should provide students the opportunity to experience a variety of ethnic and socio-economic environments. It is questionable whether experiences in one setting, be it area location or age level, would be an optimal program for future teachers.
6. The development of increased field based activity for students and faculty would indicate a need to review present faculty expectations as far as teaching load and various committee and departmental responsibilities. Faculty should be expected to participate full time in field based programs. Both CCE faculty and public school personnel need to show a commitment to field based teacher education but should participate on a volunteer basis. Consideration should also be given to a process of selecting classroom teachers who are considered good models for future teachers.
7. In-service education must be an inherent component of any field based program. The in-service program should be developed by the College of Education faculty and school representatives. The Field Center Development Team has recommended the formation of a Center Coordinating Committee for each field program. (See

Center West Proposal) The key features of the plan are the in-service function of the Committee relative to supervision and the Professional Development Fund earmarked for developing classroom teaching competencies.

8. The College of Education must organize more effectively to meet the in-service need. Present organization may be adequate for normal campus based programs but lacks organizing power for field based programs. We recommend that the Field Center Team conceptualize an organizational model for in-service education. The main goal of the model would be to determine the major needs of the teachers in field based operations and determine what expertise is available within the College of Education to meet these needs. We suggest considering some broad areas as organizing elements. These broad areas would need to be developed into clearer and more restrictive competency areas. We offer the following as suitable broad areas:

- A. Instruction
 - (1) Accountable
 - (2) Open, Informal
- B. Curriculum Development
 - (1) Accountable
 - (2) Open, Informal
- C. Supervision
- D. Administration
- E. Human Relations
- F. Counseling
- G. Program Evaluation and Research
- H. Mediated Instruction
- I. Subject and skill competency areas
- J. Plus others

Developing a field based teacher education program is not a simple task. It involves new roles for university faculty as well as classroom teachers. We just can't take our campus based program and "dump" it on the schools. Neither the C.O.E. nor

the classroom teacher is ready for such a happening. The key is initial joint planning and implementing in an open, honest and collaborative manner. Is the effort worthwhile? Is it practical?

Cleveland State University
College of Education
September 1973

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Creswell, J. L., and Crittenden, W., "Pre-student-teaching in Elementary School Mathematics: Theory Tested in the Classroom", Journal of Teacher Education, Summer, 1972, 211-214.
- Dyrli, O.E., "Involving Prospective Teachers with Children: A Workable Model," Journal of Teacher Education, Winter, 1972, 461-463.
- Edelfelt, Roy A., "The Reform of Teacher Education -- Key to Better Schools," Today's Education, April, 1973, 20-25.
- Merritt, D. L., "Teacher Education Center: Getting it All Together," Contemporary Education, October, 1972, 131-133.
- Peck, B., "Ongoing On-site Teacher Training," Times Education Supplement, April 21, 1972, 74-77.
- Pilcher, Paul, "Teachers Centers: Can They Work Here," Phi Delta Kappan, January, 1973, 340-343.
- Tessier, K., "Mini-Courses for In-Service Education," AV Instructor, June, 1971, 80.
- Willems, L., and Brown, M. H., "Teaching Center Assists in Resource Use," Educational Leadership, November, 1972, 131-133.